

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/663,672	09/17/2003	Masanori Hashiba	OGW-0285	2466	
23353	7590 06/02/2005		EXAMINER		
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING			DIXON, MERRICK L		
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501		01	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20036		1774		

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•		
		10/663,672	HASHIBA ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Merrick Dixon	1774			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	•		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or to treply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicat ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	tion.		
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 M</u>	farch 2005.				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		action is non-final.				
3)□	·					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)□ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>15 and 16</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	` '		
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) [Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application of the certified copies not received. MERR	ion No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	• •					
2) ☐ Notic 3) ⊠ Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-18-05</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/663,672 Page 2

Art Unit: 1774

1. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 15, line 4, the phrase, "said fiber" lacks proper antecedent basis.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Haile et al (US 6582818).

 The reference teaches the claimed invention including a **process** for making fiber board comprising melt spinning polylactic acid resin and natural fibers to form a sheet and molding same into a fiberboard- col 11, line 64- col 12, line 6; col 13, lines 58-59; col 14, lines 1-13; col 14, lines 48-53. It is noted the manipulative limitations are what's

Art Unit: 1774

germane to the instant question for patentability and accordingly, the instant office action reflects such.

In the Alternative:

The resin 's remaining monomer quantity (500 ppm or less), is directed to article limitation and is of no patentable consequences to the instant question for patentability which must be manipulatively distinct. Ex parte Pfeiffer, 1962 C.D. 408(1961). It is submitted, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to facilitate monomer of the reference with such quality, as claimed, depending on desire final product properties/characteristics.

5. Claims 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haile et al(US 6582818 B2) in view of Papsin Jr(US 6281298 B1).

The cited primary reference to Haile et al teaches the basic claimed invention including a process for making fiber board comprising melt spinning polylactic acid resin and natural fibers to form a sheet and molding same into a fiberboard- col 11, line 64- col 12, line 6; col 13, lines 58-59; col 14, lines 1-13; col 14, lines 48-53. the primary reference is silent to kneading its acid resin with polycarbodimide. The secondary reference to Papsin jr, however, teaches that it is known in the art to perform such kneading of the aforementioned material, during processes such as taught by the primary reference- col 9, lines 49-61; col 13, lines 20-26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to combine the teachings

Application/Control Number: 10/663,672 Page 4

Art Unit: 1774

of the secondary reference and add such well known adhesive enhancer material, such as polycarbodimide additives to the primary reference, in the absence of unexpected results. Such a combination would be obvious to better adhere the fiberboard material to a substrate- Papsin jr, col 9, lines 52-57.

6

Claims 10-14 are allowed.

7

Applicant's arguments filed 3-1-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants cancel the outstanding claims and presented new claims 10-16. However, it is noted, in the process claim 15(new), applicants hot-presses the sheet to form a fiberboard. Earlier claim 8, recites merely hot pressing the sheet. A new reference was employ to address this limitation.

8.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1774

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.

Applicants who wish to send a facsimile (draft copies) for the examiner's immediate review can do so by using the Examiner's personal fax number at 571-273-1520. The faxing of all papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 O.G. 30 (November 15, 1989). NOTE: All facsimiles sent to the examiner's personal fax number should be in draft-forms and will be treated as informal.

Same facsimiles will not be entered in the related applications unless otherwise agreed and noted by the examiner.

The fax number for all other fascimile is 703-872-9306.

Information about **the status of an application** may be obtained from the Patent Information Retrieval system (**Private PAIR**).

Status inquires for **published applications** may be retrieved from either **Private PAIR** or **Public PAIR**. Questions about the PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center at **866-217-9197**.

Any questions concerning the instant communication should be directed to Examiner Dixon, at 571-272-1520, Mondays to Thursdays, between 12 noon and 8 PM, eastern time. The examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Rena Dye, can be reached at 571-272-3186.

Merrick Dixon

Primary Examiner

Group 1700